

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 2587 Jeffery Willard Lakela 10/605,588 10/10/2003 **EXAMINER** 7590 04/27/2004 Jeffery W. Lakela VALENTI, ANDREA M 5629 Palo Road 41 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Aurora, MN 55705 3643

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

···		Application No.	Applicant(s)	l.o.	
Office Action Summary		10/605,588	LAKELA, JEFFE	LAKELA, JEFFERY WILLARD	
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Andrea M. Valenti	3643		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence a	nddress	
A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication as period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by saving reply received by the Office later than three months after the reply attent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thi eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered time NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
′—	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice unc	This action is non-final. Swance except for formal materials	•	ne merits is	
Disposit	ion of Claims		·		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya crection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bustee the attached detailed Office action for a certified copies.	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this Nationa	al Stage	
Attachmen	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice (3) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE r No(s)/Mail Date 2.	, ————————————————————————————————————	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT 	ΓΟ-152)	

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,329,879 to Walton in view of U.S. Patent No. 554,129 to Lennon.

Regarding Claim 1, Walton teaches a ramp that ascends to, and descends from, a cat litter box access point (Walton Fig. 2 #82). Walton is silent on the louvered component of this invention. However, Lennon teaches a ramp with a louvered component closely resembling a cut-out from the louvered section of a louvered door, consisting of 2 opposing parallel rectangular columns (Lennon A), and a plurality of parallel, equally spaced, and equally angled, louver boards (slats) that extend perpendicular to, and between, the 2 opposing parallel rectangular columns, with the louver boards (slats) angling upward relative to the opposing parallel rectangular columns in the direction of ascension up the louvered ramp (Lennon Fig. 3 B); the ridges of the louver boards (slats) inherently facilitating the removal of litter from the cat's paws as it descends the louvered ramp, allowing the dislodged litter to fall through the cracks between the louver boards (slats), into a collection tray (Lennon C) situated underneath this invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Walton with the louvered

Art Unit: 3643

teachings of Lennon for enhanced traction along the ramp as taught by Lennon (Lennon page 1 line 15).

Regarding Claim 2, Walton as modified teaches the louvered ramp attaches to a litter box, for the purpose of securing this invention to the litter box, as well as elevating the ascended end of the louvered component (Walton #83).

Regarding Claim 4, Walton as modified teaches the louvered ramp does not require attachment to a litter box, but is free standing, and is situated with the ascended end of the louvered component positioned against, or in close proximity to, a litter box access point (Walton Fig. 2 #82).

Regarding Claim 5, Walton as modified teaches a louvered ramp the ascended end of the louvered component being elevated by 2 right triangles, each right triangle being fastened to the opposing parallel rectangular columns of the louvered component (Walton Fig. 2 #82).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,329,879 to Walton in view of U.S. Patent No. 554,129 to Lennon as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 788,424 to Ochs.

Regarding Claim 3, Walton as modified is silent on the louvered ramp attaches to a litter box with 2 adjustably sliding hooks; the adjustably sliding hooks being secured to the louvered component at the outside edges of the opposing parallel rectangular columns at the ascended end of the louvered ramp. However, Oches teaches a ramp attached by 2 adjustable hooks secured to parallel rectangular columns (Ochs Fig. 1

Art Unit: 3643

#10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Walton with the teachings of Ochs since the modification is merely an engineering design choice involving the selection of an alternate equivalent means of securing a ramp to a structure for ease of assembly and does not present a patentably distinct limitation.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,329,878 to McCauley in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,797,352 to Ebert.

Regarding Claim 1, McCauley teaches a ramp invention, that ascends to, and descends from, a cat litter box access point (McCauley Fig. 1 #36) consisting of 2 opposing parallel rectangular columns (McCauley # 36B). McCauley is silent on the louvered component. However, Ebert teaches a ramp with the louvered (Ebert #3) component of this invention, closely resembling a cut-out from the louvered section of a louvered door, a plurality of parallel, equally spaced, and equally angled, louver boards (slats) that extend perpendicular to, and between, the 2 opposing parallel rectangular columns, with the louver boards (slats) angling upward relative to the opposing parallel rectangular columns in the direction of ascension up the louvered ramp; the ridges of the louver boards (slats) facilitating the removal of litter from the cat's paws as it descends the louvered ramp, allowing the dislodged litter to fall through the cracks between the louver boards (slats), into a collection tray (Ebert #11) situated underneath this invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 3643

teachings at the time of the invention to prevent the animal from tracking the litter outside the litter box area as taught by Ebert.

Regarding Claim 2, McCauley as modified teaches a louvered ramp that attaches to a litter box, for the purpose of securing this invention to the litter box, as well as elevating the ascended end of the louvered component (McCauley Fig. 2 #44).

Regarding Claim 3, McCauley as modified teaches that the ramp attaches to a litter box with hooks (McCauley Fig. 2 #44 and 42); hooks being secured to the louvered component at the outside edges of the opposing parallel rectangular columns at the ascended end of the louvered ramp. McCauley as modified is silent on the hooks being two adjustable hooks. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings since the modification is merely making an existing element adjustable to accommodate different size litter container and does not present a patentably distinct limitation [In re Stevens, 212 F.2d 197, 198, 101 USPQ 284, 285 (CCPA 1954)].

Regarding Claim 4, McCauley as modified teaches that the ramp does not require attachment to a litter box, but is free standing, and is situated with the ascended end of the louvered component positioned against, or in close proximity to, a litter box access point (McCauley Fig. 2 #36).

Regarding Claim 5, McCauley as modified teaches that the ramp at the ascended end of the louvered component being elevated by 2 right triangles, each right triangle being fastened to the opposing parallel rectangular columns of the louvered component (McCauley #36B).

Application/Control Number: 10/605,588 Page 6

Art Unit: 3643

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

French Patent FR 2700920A1; U.S. Patent No. 1,360,082; U.S. Patent Pub 2003/0217700; U.S. Patent No. 3,618,568; and U.S. Patent No. 4,088,235.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Valenti whose telephone number is 703-305-3010. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm M-F; Alternating Fridays Off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea M. Valenti

Examiner Art Unit 3643

21 April 2004

Peter M. Poon

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Contor 3600

Technology Center 3600

3